

REMARKS

Claims 28-47 have been presented for examination in the above-identified U.S. Patent Application.

5

Claims 28-47 have been rejected in Office Action dated April 04, 2004.

Claims 28-47 have been amended by this Amendment A.

10

Claims 28-47 are still in the Application and reconsideration of the Application is hereby respectfully requested.

15

Referring to Office Action dated April 04, 2004, beginning in section 3 of page 2, Claims 28-31, 33-35, 37-43, and 45-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,721,912 issued in the name of Stepczyk.

20

Before addressing the relationship between the invention of the Application and the material disclosed by the Stepczyk reference, the invention of the Application will be summarized. The present invention relates to the translation of source elements of a source file into translation elements of a translation file. More specifically the Claims are directed to the simultaneous display of the source elements and the translation elements. When the source element and the associated translation element are displayed, a knowledgeable user can detect or the translation system can prompt the user to detect, by means of icons on the screen, errors or

25

30

weaknesses in the element to element translation. The display system includes a user input port that permits the user to correct the translation element, as directly viewed on the screen. This user graphical interface and procedure
5 permits a more rapid and accurate translation when used by an experienced translator/user. Aside from some formal matters, Claims 28 and 37 have been amended to specify that what is being compared in the two windows of the display device are source elements and translation elements. The
10 user input directly changes a translation element that is associated with a source element.

Turning now to the Stepczyk reference, this reference has been applied to Claims 28 and 37, the independent
15 Claims of the Application. The difference between the Stepczyk and the present invention can be summarized as follows. The present invention relates to the correction of a software translation file. The Stepczyk reference relates to the creation of a technique for the generation
20 of the translation procedure. Specifically, the most pertinent section of the reference, i.e., Col. 9, lines 37, what is not being corrected is the translation, i.e., Result 144, but the Rule 142, cf. the cited section. Expressed another way, the cited section relates, in
25 Stepczyk, Claim 1 to the "specifying the data translation" element. This limitation leads to the second point of departure, the materials in the cited section all deal specifically with data translation. Claims 28 and 37 of the Application are not so limited. The Claims permit the
30 correction of any translation element based on a comparison with a source element without limitation as to whether it is a data element or a program element. In viewing the

reference, the data field is used as an indicia field and is not corrected in the translation file, as is true in the present invention. Expressed another way, while it is true that correction of Rule 142 in Fig. 8 will result in a
5 corrected value for Result 144, in the present invention the Rule 142, not being part of the translation file would not even be present. Consequently, the relationship of the Stepczyk reference to the present invention is only evident by cutting and pasting the elements of the reference
10 together using the application as a template. As a further indication that the Stepczyk reference is not a comparison of source file and a translation file during a translation process, notice that Value 134 in Fig. 8 is described in Column 9, line 29 as being "sample value." Clearly, a
15 source file and a translation file are not being contemplated in the reference. Therefore rejection of Claims 28 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Stepczyk is respectfully traversed.

20 Claims 29-31 and 33-35, rejected in Paragraph 3 of the Office Action as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Stepczyk, depend from Claim 28, a Claim now believed to be in condition for allowance. For this reason, Claims 29-31 and 33-35 are believed to be condition for allowance
25 for the same reason. Similarly, Claims 38-43 and 45-47, rejected in Paragraph 3 of the Office Action as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Stepczyk, depend from Claim 37, a claim now believed to be in condition for allowance. For this reason, Claims 38-43 and 45-47 are
30 believed to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, rejection of Claims 29-31, 33-35, 38-43, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Stepczyk is respectfully traversed.

Referring to Paragraph 5, Claims 32 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepczyk (cited above) in view of U.S. Patent 6,425,118 issued in the name of Molloy et al. Claim 32 depends from Claim 28 and Claim 44 depends from Claim 37, both Claim 28 and Claim 37 being Claims believed to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, Claims 32 and 44 are believed to be in condition for allowance for that reason. Referring to Paragraph 6, Claim 36 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepczyk, cited above in view of official notice. Claim 36 depends from Claim 28, a Claim believed to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, Claim 36 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Therefore, rejection of Claims 28-31, 33-35, 37-43 and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Stepczyk is respectfully traversed. Rejection of Claims 32 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepczyk in view of Molloy is respectfully traversed. And rejection of Claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stepczyk in view of an official notice is respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing discussion and the foregoing
5 amendments, it is believed that Claims 28-47 are now in
condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 28-47 is
hereby respectfully requested. Applicant hereby
respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be
issued in this Application.

10 Should any issues remain unresolved that could be
dispose of by a telephonic interview, Examiner is
respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

15 Respectfully submitted,



20 William W. Holloway
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,182

25 Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(281) 274-4064